

JUN 24 1998

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

ORIGINAL
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

In the Matter of)

Southwestern Bell Telephone Company,)
Pacific Bell, and Nevada Bell)

Petition for Relief from Regulation)
Pursuant to Section 706 of the)
Telecommunications Act of 1996 and)
47 U.S.C. § 160 for ADSL)
Infrastructure and Service)

CC Docket No. 98-91

COMMENTS OF E.SPIRE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Riley M. Murphy
Vice President and General Counsel
E.SPIRE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
131 National Business Parkway
Suite 100
Annapolis Junction, Maryland 20701

Brad E. Mutschelknaus
Marieann Z. Machida
KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP
1200 19th Street, N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20036

Attorneys for e.spire

Dated: June 24, 1998

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

0412

RECEIVED

JUN 24 1998

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

In the Matter of)
)
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company,)
Pacific Bell, and Nevada Bell)
)
Petition for Relief from Regulation) CC Docket No. 98-91
Pursuant to Section 706 of the)
Telecommunications Act of 1996 and)
47 U.S.C. § 160 for ADSL)
Infrastructure and Service)

COMMENTS OF E.SPIRE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

e. spire Communications, Inc. ("e.spire")¹, by its attorneys and pursuant to the Commission's Public Notice DA-98-1111 released June 11, 1998, hereby submits these comments in opposition to the Petition of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, Pacific Bell and Nevada Bell (collectively "SBC") for Relief from Regulation Pursuant to Sections 10 and 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the "1996 Act").² As a provider of advanced telecommunications services, e.spire has invested heavily in the development of digital networks across the country. However, in order to offer its advanced telecommunications services ubiquitously, e.spire must be able to interconnect and collocate with ILEC digital and broadband facilities on reasonable terms, as set forth in Section 251(c) of the 1996 Act. The stated goal of encouraging deployment of advanced telecommunications capability will be served not by

¹ e.spire formerly was known as American Communications Services, Inc. ("ACSI").

² 47 U.S.C. § 160; Pub. L. 104-104, Title VII, §706. See 47 U.S.C. § 157 nt.

precipitously granting the forbearance petitions of incumbent local exchange carriers that claim to meet the requirements of Sections 251(c) and 271 on scant evidence, but rather by clarifying the rights of competitive local exchange carriers, such as e.spire, under the 1996 Act as described by the Association for Local Telecommunications Services ("ALTS") in its Petition for a Declaratory Ruling Establishing the Conditions Necessary to Promote Deployment of Advanced Telecommunications Capability Under Section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.³

e.spire respectfully submits that the Commission must deny SBC's request for forbearance from regulation. The SBC petition is nothing more than another veiled attempt by an RBOC to circumvent the central competitive provisions of the 1996 Act. If, as SBC states, there is adequate competition to warrant forbearance from regulation,⁴ and if, as SBC states, it is committed to providing unbundled ADSL-capable loops on a non-discriminatory basis, collocation for ADSL equipment and ISP unbundling of ADSL,⁵ then SBC should have no difficulty showing that it has satisfied all of the requirements of Sections 251(c) and 271 as required by Section 10 of the 1996 Act.⁶ Barring such a showing, the Commission cannot forbear from regulating. The fact is that SBC has not fully implemented Sections 251(c) and

³ CC Docket No. 98-78. Pursuant to the Commission's Public Notice, DA No. 98-1019 released June 3, 1998, e.spire filed comments supporting the ALTS petition on June 18, 1998. *See* Attachment A. e.spire respectfully incorporates those comments in their entirety herein.

⁴ *See* Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, Pacific Bell, and Nevada Bell Petition for Relief from Regulation Pursuant to Section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and 47 U.S.C. § 160 for ADSL Infrastructure Service, CC Docket No. 98-91, p. 1 (filed June 9, 1998).

⁵ *See id.* at 17-21.

⁶ *See* 47 U.S.C. § 160(d) ("[e]xcept as provided in section 251(f) of this title, the Commission may not forbear from applying the requirements of section 251(c) or 271 . . . until it determines that those requirements have been fully implemented.").

271. Thus, the SBC petition, like the petitions of Bell Atlantic, US WEST and Ameritech before it, is premature.⁷

On the basis of the foregoing, e.spire requests that the Commission deny SBC's request for forbearance from regulation. At most, the Commission should incorporate the record herein into any Section 706(b) Notice of Inquiry that the Commission chooses to initiate.

Respectfully submitted,

E.SPIRE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

By:



Riley M. Murphy
Vice President and General Counsel
E.SPIRE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
131 National Business Parkway
Suite 100
Annapolis Junction, Maryland 20701

Brad E. Mutschelknaus
Marieann Z. Machida
KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP
1200 19th Street, N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20036

Its Attorneys

Dated: June 24, 1998

⁷ On April 6, 1998, e.spire (then ACSI) filed a Consolidated Opposition to the Petitions of Bell Atlantic, US WEST and Ameritech for similar regulatory relief, which it respectfully incorporates, in its entirety, herein. See Petition of Bell Atlantic for Relief from Barriers to Deployment of Advanced Telecommunications Services, CC Docket No. 98-11, Petition of US WEST for Relief from Barriers to Deployment of Advanced Telecommunications Services, CC Docket No. 98-26, Petition of Ameritech for Relief from Barriers to Deployment of Advanced Telecommunications Services, CC Docket No. 98-32, Consolidated Opposition of ACSI (filed April 6, 1998) (appended hereto as Attachment B).

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

JUN 18 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of)
)
Petition of the Association for Local)
Telecommunications Services (ALTS) for a)
Declaratory Ruling Establishing Conditions)
Necessary to Promote Deployment of)
Advanced Telecommunications Capability)
Under Section 706 of the Telecommunications)
Act of 1996)

CC Docket No. 98-78

COMMENTS OF e.spire COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Riley M. Murphy
General Counsel and Executive Vice President
Legal and Regulatory Affairs
e.spire COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
133 National Business Parkway, Suite 200
Annapolis Junction, Maryland 20701
(301) 361-4200

Brad E. Mutschelknaus
Ross A. Buntrock
KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP
1200 19th Street, NW, Fifth Floor
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 955-9600

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction and Summary	1
I. SECTION 251(c) INTERCONNECTION, COLLOCATION, UNBUNDLING AND RESALE OBLIGATIONS ARE APPLICABLE TO ILEC DIGITAL AND BROADBAND NETWORKS AND MUST BE IMPLEMENTED FULLY TO ACHIEVE THE GOALS OF SECTION 706	3
A. The Commission Should Clarify that Section 251(c) is Applicable to Interconnection For Data Services	4
B. CLECs Must Have Unbundled Access to xDSL Functionality Including Unbundled Digital Loops, Subloop Elements and Preordering Functions	4
C. The Commission Must Establish New Collocation Rules to Ensure Reasonable and Nondiscriminatory Access to ILEC Data Facilities	6
II. SECTION 251(h) PREVENTS ILECs FROM USING AFFILIATES TO AVOID INTERCONNECTION, UNBUNDLING AND RESALE REQUIREMENTS	8
III. THE COMMISSION SHOULD PRESERVE AND ENHANCE PRO- COMPETITIVE RULES AND POLICIES ADOPTED BY STATE COMMISSIONS	10
Conclusion	11

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
)	
Petition of the Association for Local)	
Telecommunications Services (ALTS) for a)	
Declaratory Ruling Establishing Conditions)	CC Docket No. 98-78
Necessary to Promote Deployment of)	
Advanced Telecommunications Capability)	
Under Section 706 of the Telecommunications)	
Act of 1996)	

To: The Commission

COMMENTS OF e.spire COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

e.spire Communications, Inc. ("e.spire" or "the Company"),¹ by its attorneys and pursuant to the Commission's Public Notice, DA No. 98-1019 released June 3, 1998, submits these comments in support of the Petition of the Association for Local Telecommunications Services ("ALTS").

Introduction and Summary

e.spire is a competitive local exchange carrier ("CLEC") that provides integrated local voice and data communications services in small and mid-sized metropolitan markets throughout the southern and southwestern United States. Utilizing its own SONET-based networks in 32 markets and 45 data switches installed nationwide, e.spire already is providing its customers with

¹ e.spire formerly was known as American Communications Services, Inc. (ACSI).

advanced telecommunications services. e.spire continues to make enormous investments in digital networks in markets across the country. However, in order to continue the ambitious expansion of local networks and provide xDSL and other advanced technologies, e.spire must be able to interconnect and collocate with ILEC digital and broadband facilities on reasonable terms, as required by Section 251(c) of the Act. As proposed in the ALTS Petition, Commission clarification of CLECs rights under the Act will facilitate the deployment of advanced telecommunications technologies in a timely and efficient fashion in fulfillment of Section 706.²

The stated goal of Section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("1996 Act") to encourage universal deployment of "advanced telecommunications capability" is a laudable one. e.spire and other CLECs are deploying billions of dollars of risk capital to deliver just such advanced communications services all across the nation -- in small communities such as Greenville, South Carolina and Montgomery, Alabama as well as large urban centers. e.spire is rolling out advanced services because customers are demanding them, *not* in the hopes of some government concession. However, this prodigious effort could quickly be derailed by precipitous and premature Commission action under Section 706 which has the effect of denying CLECs access to critical data service functionality included in bottleneck incumbent local exchange carrier ("ILEC") ILEC facilities. e.spire submits the best way to expand the availability of advanced services is to facilitate interconnection and unbundling of data networks, *not* by inadvertently creating new data service bottlenecks.

It is imperative that the Commission require full implementation of the interconnection, collocation, unbundling, and resale obligations of Sections 251, 252 and 271 of the Act as they relate to advanced digital and broadband services. The Commission should not allow ILECs to

² Pub. L. 104-104, Title VII, § 706 [hereinafter "*Section 706*"]. See 47 U.S.C. § 157 nt.

evade the competitive mandate of the Act either by exempting advanced digital technologies from the requirements of the Act, or by allowing to ILEC alter ego affiliates to move advanced data switches, electronics, and other unbundled network elements (“UNEs”) associated with advanced telecommunications services beyond the purview of Sections 251 and 252.

I. SECTION 251(c) INTERCONNECTION, COLLOCATION, UNBUNDLING AND RESALE OBLIGATIONS ARE APPLICABLE TO ILEC DIGITAL AND BROADBAND NETWORKS AND MUST BE IMPLEMENTED FULLY TO ACHIEVE THE GOALS OF SECTION 706

Under Section 706 of the Act, Congress required the FCC and each State commission to “encourage the deployment on a *reasonable and timely basis* of advanced telecommunications capability to all Americans.”³ However, as evidenced by their attempt to evade the Section 251 and 252 obligations as they apply to advanced services and facilities, it is clear that ILECs are bent on frustrating the Section 706 mandate, under which several RBOCs now seek relief. In order to accomplish the goals of Section 706, the Commission must reaffirm that the ILECs’ digital and broadband services and facilities are subject to all of the interconnection, collocation, unbundling and resale obligations contained in Sections 251(c), 252, and in the case of RBOCs, 271 of the Act.

³ *Section 706(a)* (emphasis added).

A. The Commission Should Clarify that Section 251(c) is Applicable to Interconnection For Data Services

Several ILECs contend⁴ that frame relay service is not an “exchange service” under Section 251(c), and therefore, they have no duty to provide interconnection pursuant to the terms of that section. However, without the ability to interconnect with the ILECs’ existing local data networks and facilities on a nondiscriminatory basis, the widespread deployment of broadband capabilities by CLECs will be significantly delayed. It is axiomatic that the ability to interconnect with competing service providers is as important to the development of data competition as it has been to competition in local voice services. As importantly, the Act simply draws no distinction between voice services and basic data services for purposes of Section 251(c) interconnection, unbundling and resale obligations. The Commission should make clear that Sections 251 and 252 of the Act afford CLECs the right to request interconnection with ILECs for data services in the same manner that the Act provides for interconnection for voice services.

B. CLECs Must Have Unbundled Access to xDSL Functionality Including Unbundled Digital Loops, Subloop Elements and Preordering Functions

e.spire has been aggressively deploying facilities required to provide advanced data services all across the nation. The Company already has installed 45 state-of-the-art data switches and connected them to broadband fiber facilities capable of supporting the most advanced applications yet developed. Yet, as was the case with voice networks, ILEC local access facilities remain a critical, bottleneck “on ramp” to obtain access to these facilities. It simply is not economically feasible for e.spire to replicate the universal ILEC local access

facilities. Thus, unless e.spire can obtain access to data service functionality deployed within the ILEC local access network, e.spire will simply be unable to offer advanced services to the large majority of customers which are not directly connected to the e.spire network.

e.spire agrees with ALTS that xDSL and other data technologies clearly are subject to the unbundling requirements of Sections 251, 252, and 271,⁵ and, in light of the untenable position of several RBOCs to the contrary, the Commission should issue a declaratory ruling confirming that ILECs must provide CLECs unbundled access to the following: loops,⁶ loop electronics,⁷ subloop electronics,⁸ and preordering functions that allow CLECs to identify xDSL capable loops. Commission clarification at this point is necessary, particularly in light of ILEC refusals to fully implement the requirements of Sections 251 and 252, the mandate contained Section 706 of the Act, and the costs that would unnecessarily be imposed upon CLECs, if the untenable position of the RBOCs were allowed to stand.

e.spire echoes the concern expressed by ALTS regarding the positions taken by ILECs in proceedings throughout the country where ILECs have refused to provide interconnection to xDSL equipment, or offer xDSL functionalities as UNEs at the cost-based pricing standards

⁴ SBC, U S West and Ameritech each have refused e.spire's request to negotiate a local interconnection arrangement for frame relay traffic pursuant to Section 251(c).

⁵ *ALTS Petition* at 14.

⁶ The Commission should require ILECs to make the following categories of loops available on an unbundled basis: 2-wire analog; 4-wire analog; 2 wire digital; 4 wire digital; loops provided with electronics at cost based rates.

⁷ The Commission should clarify that ILECs must include the following electronics in the price of unbundled loops: digital loop carrier (universal, integrated, next generation); multiplexers; optical line terminating multiplexers or other optical-electrical converters; xDSL equipment, including remote DSLAMs, DSL line cards used in ISDN or DLC equipment.

⁸ Subloop electronics should include: DSL, DLC, ISDN, MUX, and OLTM.

required by Sections 251 and 252.⁹ As ALTS noted, three RBOCs have stated that they will provide CLECs only with conditioned copper wire, rather than provide CLECs access to a circuit that employs xDSL electronics, even if it requires construction of new loop facilities.¹⁰ e.spire concurs with ALTS' assessment: if CLECs are refused permission to interconnect with xDSL equipment, are refused loops with xDSL electronics, and not given access to loops free of load coils or bridge taps, CLECs will effectively be prevented from providing xDSL-based services on a significant number of loops.¹¹

C. The Commission Must Establish New Collocation Rules to Ensure Reasonable and Nondiscriminatory Access to ILEC Data Facilities

The Commission must establish new collocation rules in order to ensure that CLECs have reasonable and nondiscriminatory access to ILEC data facilities. Physical collocation of CLEC facilities in ILEC local serving offices ("LSOs") is critical to their ability to interconnect with ILEC facilities required to provide advanced telecommunications services. However, ILECs increasingly are denying CLECs physical collocation due to a lack of space in central offices.¹² Even where space is available, current rules have permitted ILECs to extract huge collocation charges which far exceed the reasonably necessary expenditures. Together these factors are erecting significant barriers to entry into the market for advanced services.

However, a number of innovative solutions are available to address the dearth of physical collocation space. Therefore, e.spire supports the ALTS Petition's request that the Commission establish new collocation rules implementing the following requirements:

⁹ *ALTS Petition* at 14-15

¹⁰ *Id.* at 15.

¹¹ *Id.* at 16-17.

- Establish that CLECs can use virtual collocation arrangements to combine UNEs.
- Provide for "cageless" collocation that allows CLECs to avoid the cost of constructing enclosures for their collocation space, and allows them to collocate in a total area of less than 10 square feet.
- Provide for enclosed collocation cages of as little as 10 square feet.
- Permit enclosed collocation without cages, such as use of locker arrangements.
- Allow multiple CLECs to share a single collocation cage.
- Allow collocated CLECs to establish cross-connects to cages of other collocated CLECs.
- Eliminate restrictions on CLECs' ability to collocate remote switching modules, xDSL electronics, internet routers and other advanced data equipment.
- Require ILECs' virtual and physical collocation rates to reflect the costing principles of Sections 251-252 of the Act.
- Establish reasonable and nondiscriminatory rules for the allocation of space preparation charges among collocated carriers.
- Establish reasonable and nondiscriminatory deployment intervals for new collocation arrangements, and expansion of existing arrangements.
- As an ongoing practice, incorporate into the Commission's collocation rules the most innovative and effective collocation provisions established by the State commissions.
- Permit walk-throughs and third-party independent verification of ILEC claims of space exhaustion to confirm that ILEC central office space is being efficiently used.

The Commission must also clarify that virtual collocation must be made available to CLECs as a means of connecting UNEs. In the aftermath of the Eighth Circuit's *Iowa Utilities*

¹² Only last month, for example, BellSouth refused to permit e.spire to establish physical collocation in four (4) important LSOs in Atlanta, due to an alleged lack of space, *and*

Board decision, many ILECs have taken the position that CLECs must physically collocate at every point in the ILEC network where two UNEs must be connected. This effectively forecloses the use of virtual collocation as a means of combining UNEs in many instances. As ALTS argues in its Petition, requiring physical collocation at every ILEC end office and tandem in order to accomplish collocation is not only a strained and unreasonable interpretation of the Eight Circuit decision, but it also makes connection of UNEs extremely cost prohibitive.¹³ Therefore, e.spire is of the position that virtual collocation must be made available at all points of aggregation along the loop, including the controlled environmental vault or its above-ground equivalent, as well as any other points of aggregation where DLCs, MUXs, OLTMs and DSLs are deployed. Moreover, line cards must be installed in aggregating equipment and CLECs must be able to cross-connect aggregating equipment to distribution or feeder plant. Allowing ILECs to require physical collocation is tantamount to disallowing collocation at all.

In sum, e.spire concurs with ALTS that accomplishment of the purposes of Section 706 requires that the Commission revise its collocation rules to increase available collocation space, broaden the use that may be made of such collocation space, and dramatically reduce the expense of physical collocation.

II. SECTION 251(h) PREVENTS ILECs FROM USING AFFILIATES TO AVOID INTERCONNECTION, UNBUNDLING AND RESALE REQUIREMENTS

In response to the competitive pressures from CLECs, ILECs have announced rollout plans for xDSL and have commenced wide-scale deployment of telecommunications technologies and facilities. Simultaneously, the ILECs have pursued a strategy of shielding their

¹³ denied e.spire's request to conduct a "walk-through" to verify that space is exhausted. *ALTS Petition* at 18.

newly developed advanced technologies from competition by: (1) seeking regulatory relief from the Commission pursuant to Section 706 that would render their data facilities exempt them from Sections 251 and 252 of the Act; and (2) transferring data switches and UNEs to affiliates, and arguing that they are not subject to the requirements of 251(c).¹⁴ The ILECs cannot have it both ways.

e.spire indicated in its comments in CC Docket No. 98-39 that "Section 251(h) of the Communications Act evinces a clear intent by Congress to foreclose the possibility of ILEC legal and regulatory maneuvering around the obligations imposed by Sections 251 and 252."¹⁵ The Act is technology neutral, and the Commission should not impose a regulatory structure that would afford differing technologies different regulatory treatment, particularly when such technologies are impossibly intertwined, interchangeable and difficult to distinguish. Permitting the transfer of selected data facilities to an ILEC affiliate will simply encourage ILECs to transfer competitively sensitive functionality to the affiliate, and enmesh regulators in endless disputes regarding the propriety of each such reassignment. Therefore, e.spire agrees with ALTS that the Commission should issue a ruling affirming that the provisions of Sections 251, 252 and 271 are applicable to advanced data networks.

¹⁴ See, e.g., *Petition of Ameritech Corporation to Remove Barriers to Investment in Advanced Telecommunications Capability*, CC Docket No. 98-32 (filed Mar. 5, 1998) (e.spire filed a Consolidated Opposition to Ameritech's Petition and the Section 706 Petitions of Bell Atlantic, CC Docket No. 98-11, and U S West, CC Docket No. 98-26, on Apr. 6, 1998).

¹⁵ See *Comments of e.spire Communications, Inc.*, CC Docket No. 98-39 at 2.

III. THE COMMISSION SHOULD PRESERVE AND ENHANCE PRO-COMPETITIVE RULES AND POLICIES ADOPTED BY STATE COMMISSIONS

e.spire agrees with ALTS' contention that the innovative initiatives adopted by State commissions which have fostered prodigious competition and have advanced the deployment of advanced telecommunications capability should be preserved and enhanced.¹⁶ Section 706 states unequivocally that the "Commission and each State commission...shall encourage the deployment" of advanced telecommunications capabilities, and thereby establishes the dual jurisdiction similar to that established in Sections 251, 252 and 271.¹⁷ The Commission, therefore, should not take unilateral action under Section 706 that would diminish or destroy the effect of State actions that have provided CLECs with various combinations of UNEs that have been critical to the deployment of CLEC data services, including State decisions that have resulted in ILECs being required to provide: subloop components upon request; digital unbundled loops; non-discriminatory access to digital equipment and services. e.spire agrees with ALTS that these decisions must be preserved.

¹⁶ See *ALTS Petition* at 36.

¹⁷ *Section 706(a)*.

Conclusion


For all the foregoing reasons, e.spire requests that the Commission issue a declaratory ruling that the competitive provisions of Sections 251, 252, and 271 of the communications Act apply to the deployment of advanced data networks, and that CLECs have the same rights with respect to access to advanced data networks as they have for plain old telephone service as well as other telecommunications services.

Respectfully submitted,

e.spire COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Riley M. Murphy
General Counsel and Executive Vice President
Legal and Regulatory Affairs
e.spire COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
133 National Business Parkway, Suite 200
Annapolis Junction, Maryland 20701
(301) 361-4200

June 18, 1998

By: 
Brad E. Mutschelknaus
Ross A. Buntrock
KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP
1200 19th Street, NW, Fifth Floor
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 955-9600

Its Attorneys

DUPLICATE
RECEIVED

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

APR 6 - 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of

Petition of Bell Atlantic for Relief
from Barriers to Deployment of
Advanced Telecommunications Services

CC Docket No. 98-11

Petition of US WEST for Relief from
Barriers to Deployment of Advanced
Telecommunications Services

CC Docket No. 98-26

Petition of Ameritech for Relief from
Barriers to Deployment of Advanced
Telecommunications Services

CC Docket No. 98-32

CONSOLIDATED OPPOSITION OF ACSI

Riley M. Murphy
James C. Falvey
AMERICAN COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, INC.
131 National Business Parkway
Suite 100
Annapolis Junction, MD 20701

Brad E. Mutschelknaus
Edward A. Yorkgitis, Jr.
John J. Heitmann
KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP
1200 19th Street, N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20036

Attorneys for ACSI

SUMMARY

Being unable or unwilling to comply with the core procompetitive provisions of the Act, Petitioners Bell Atlantic, U S West and Ameritech have asked the Commission to eliminate them as they apply to advanced telecommunications services. Specifically, the Petitions seek forbearance from Sections 251(c), 271 and 272 in this context. ACSI believes that the Commission has no statutory basis for granting these Petitions and should deny them accordingly.

The Commission's forbearance authority is set forth in Section 10, not Section 706, as the Petitioners claim. By its terms, in addition to the generally applicable standards for forbearance, Section 10 forbids the Commission to forbear from enforcing the requirements of Sections 251(c) and 271 before a petitioner has demonstrated that it has fully implemented those provisions. None of the Petitioners has attempted to make such a showing here. Ironically, with respect to data-service-related interconnection, unbundling, and resale, ACSI's experience shows that the Petitioners have not been burdened by Section 251; rather, they refuse to comply with it.

Although Section 10 does not proscribe the Commission's forbearance authority with respect to the separate affiliate requirements of Section 272, the Petitioners have not made the required tripartite showing under Section 10 that would allow the Commission to forbear from enforcing Section 272. Indeed, the Petitioners are unable to show (1) why Section 272's competitive **safeguards** are no longer necessary to ensure Petitioners' rates and practices related to *any* telecommunications service are just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory, (2) how consumers would benefit *only* if the Petitioners were freed from such requirements, and (3) how such forbearance would be in the public interest.

Contrary to the Petitioners' contentions, Section 706 of the 1996 Act contains no independent source of forbearance authority that would permit the Commission to forbear from enforcing Sections 251(c), 271 or 272. In Section 706, Congress merely listed "regulatory forbearance" as one of the regulating methods by which the Commission can encourage investment in advanced telecommunications infrastructure – it did not alter, augment or otherwise supplement the Commission's authority to forbear as defined in Section 10. Thus, if the Commission were to determine that specific action was required by Section 706, it could use its Section 10 forbearance authority only to the extent consistent with the requirements of that section.

The Commission also must deny requests for a "global data LATA" or other data-service-specific LATA relief. As the Commission previously has recognized, such requests would require forbearance from Section 271 which Section 10 proscribes the Commission from granting.

Finally, the Commission also must deny requests made by the Petitioners for reconsideration of the Commission's interconnection, unbundling, and resale rules, as they apply to high speed packetized data services. ACSI believes that such action is necessary because the RBOC requests are unfounded, procedurally defective and, above all else, premature. ACSI's negotiating experience with each of the Petitioners demonstrates that, rather than relieve the Petitioners from the requirements of Section 251(c), the Commission should underscore that these requirements continue to apply in full force to data related interconnection, unbundling, and resale.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY	i
I. INTRODUCTION	2
I. THE PETITIONERS HAVE NOT MADE THE MINIMUM SHOWING REQUIRED EVEN TO REQUEST FORBEARANCE TREATMENT	5
A. The Petitioners Have Not Satisfied the Preconditions for Seeking Forbearance from the Requirements of Sections 251(c) and 271	5
B. Petitioners Have Failed to Demonstrate that Forbearance From Enforcement of Section 272's Requirements Satisfies Section 10 Conditions	10
II. THE COMMISSION CANNOT GRANT THE LATA-RELATED "RELIEF" REQUESTED WITHOUT UNLAWFULLY ABROGATING SECTION 271	15
III. RBOC REQUESTS FOR RELIEF FROM UNBUNDLING AND RESALE REQUIREMENTS ARE BOTH PROCEDURALLY DEFECTIVE AND PREMATURE	16
CONCLUSION	18

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
)	
Petition of Bell Atlantic for Relief)	CC Docket No. 98-11
from Barriers to Deployment of)	
Advanced Telecommunications Services)	
)	
Petition of US WEST for Relief from)	CC Docket No. 98-26
Barriers to Deployment of Advanced)	
Telecommunications Services)	
)	
Petition of Ameritech for Relief from)	CC Docket No. 98-32
Barriers to Deployment of Advanced)	
Telecommunications Services)	
)	

CONSOLIDATED OPPOSITION OF ACSI

Pursuant to the Commission's March 16, 1998 Order in the above-captioned dockets, American Communications Services, Inc. ("ACSI"), by its attorneys, respectfully submits these comments in opposition to the above-captioned Petitions for "Relief from Barriers to Deployment of Advanced Telecommunications Services" pursuant to Section 706(a) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("1996 Act"),¹ filed by Bell Atlantic Corporation ("Bell Atlantic"), U S West Communications, Inc. ("U S West") and Ameritech Corporation ("Ameritech") (collectively, the "Petitioners").

¹ Pub L. 104-104, Title VII, § 706. See 47 U.S.C. § 157 nt.

I. INTRODUCTION

While different in their presentation, the three Petitions seek similar relief. Citing Section 706(a) of the 1996 Act, the Petitioners ask the Commission to remove what they believe are regulatory "barriers to deployment of advanced telecommunications services."² The "barriers" the RBOC Petitioners would have the Commission eliminate include some of the core procompetitive provisions of the 1996 Act. Namely, the Petitioners seek to eliminate Sections 251(c), 271, and 272 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the "Act"), as they apply to high-speed packetized data and other advanced telecommunications services. Specifically, the Petitioners seek permission to:

- provide high-speed, broadband digital services without regard to LATA boundaries and the requirements of Section 271;³
- exclude such broadband digital services from otherwise applicable pricing and unbundling requirements of Section 251(c)(d);⁴ and
- sell interLATA high speed, broadband services other than through a separate affiliate, as now is required by Section 272.⁵

ACSI submits, however, that the Petitions are little more than thinly veiled attempts to circumvent the central competitive provisions of the 1996 Act, including the intensely debated Section 271 approval process. Given U S West's claim that it currently complies with the

² E.g., *Bell Atlantic Petition* at 1-4; *U S West Petition* at 1-5; *Ameritech Petition* at 2-4.

³ E.g., *Bell Atlantic Petition* at 3; *U S West Petition* at 4; *Ameritech Petition* at 2-3.

⁴ E.g., *Bell Atlantic Petition* at 3-4; *U S West Petition* at 4. Ameritech seeks to reach the same end by a different means. Specifically, Ameritech seeks "clarification" that its affiliate that satisfies *its own* proposed separation requirements is not an incumbent LEC for purposes of Section 251(c)'s interconnection, unbundling, and resale requirements. *Ameritech Petition* at 3-4.

⁵ *Bell Atlantic Petition* at 4, 18; *Ameritech Petition* at 3, 14-27 (Ameritech seeks relaxed separations requirements).